

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action issued August 11, 2005, claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as claiming the same invention as claims 1 and 7-19 of U.S. Patent No. 6,697,289. Claims 15-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as claiming the same invention as claims 20 and 26-38 of U.S. Patent No. 6,697,289. Claims 29-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as claiming the same invention as claims 39 and 45-57 of U.S. Patent No. 6,697,289. These are statutory double-patenting rejections.

Claims 1-42 are now pending in this application. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101, the statutory double-patenting rejections. As stated by the Examiner, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. The Examiner further states that the current invention is identical to the prior art (US 6,697,839) word to word except the currently amended (newly added) step of "accessing mapping data to determine whether a mapping of the filed in the form to information in the wallet exists" in the independent claims 1, 15, 29. However, an inspection of the claims of the current application and the claims of US 6,697,839 indicates that this is not the only difference. For example, comparing claim 1 of the current application and claim 1 of US 6,697,839:

| Current Application | U.S. Patent No. 6,697,839 |
|--|---|
| 1. A method for automatically entering information into form fields comprising the steps of: | 1. A method for providing access to a mobile application comprising the steps of: |

| | |
|--|---|
| storing information to be entered into at least one form field in a wallet; | storing information to be entered into at least one form field in a wallet; |
| invoking an application program in response to an indication from a user of a mobile device to do so; | invoking an application program in response to an indication from a user of a mobile device to do so; |
| scanning content transmitted from the application program to the mobile device to find a form having at least one field into which information is to be entered by the user; | scanning content transmitted from the application program to the mobile device to find a form having at least one field into which information is to be entered; |
| accessing mapping data to determine whether a mapping of the field in the form to information in the wallet exists; | |
| | translating content transmitted from the application program from an initial format of the content to a format supported by the mobile device, the format supported by the mobile device being different than the initial format of the content; |
| accessing the wallet to retrieve information to enter into the at least one field using the mapping, if at least one mapping for the form exists; | accessing the wallet to retrieve information to enter into the at least one field, if at least one mapping for the form exists; |
| entering the retrieved information into the at least one field; and | entering the retrieved information into the at least one field; and |
| transmitting the form including the entered information to the mobile device for display to the user. | transmitting the translated content including the form including the entered information to the mobile device for display to the user. |

Thus, claim 1 of US 6,697,839 includes an element, "translating content transmitted from the application program from an initial format of the content to a format supported by the mobile device, the format supported by the mobile device being different than the initial format of the content;" that is not present in claim 1 of the present invention. Therefore, it is clear that claim 1 of the present application does not claim the "same invention" as claim 1 of US 6,697,839. Similar differences are present between claim 15 of the present application and claim 20 of US 6,697,839, and between claim 29 of the present application and claim 39 of US 6,697,839. As a result, claims 2-14 of the present application are not the same as claims 7-19 of US 6,697,839, claims 16-28 of the present application are not the same as claims 26-38 of US 6,697,839, and claims 30-42 of the present application are not the same as claims 45-57 of US 6,697,839.

In view of the above, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner remove the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101. It is further respectfully submitted that the present invention is allowable over the references relied upon in the Office Action. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of this case and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/003,263
Reply to Office action of August 11, 2005

Additional Fees:

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with this application to Deposit Account No. 19-5127 (19111.0060).

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, all of the Examiner's rejections to the claims are believed to be overcome. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance for all the claims remaining in the application. Should the Examiner feel further communication would facilitate prosecution, he is urged to call the undersigned at the phone number provided below.

Respectfully Submitted,



Michael A. Schwartz
Reg. No. 40,161

Dated: October 3, 2005

Swidler Berlin LLP
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20007
(202) 424-7500